

Maureen E. McFadden, SBN 203781
LAW OFFICES OF MAUREEN E. MCFADDEN
819 Bancroft Way
Berkeley, CA 94710
Ph (510) 845-5203
Fax (510) 868-0976

Attorney for Plaintiff
MEGAN KELLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MEGAN KELLY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLERA CORPORATION and DOES 1-20,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C-07-3002 MMC

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
MAUREEN E. MCFADDEN IN SUPPORT
OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: July 28, 2008

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom 7, 19th Floor

The Honorable Maxine M. Chesney

I, Maureen E. McFadden, declare:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained within this declaration and verify that the matters alleged herein are true and correct. If called as a witness in this case, I could and would testify competently to the facts contained herein.

2. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California, and in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal, and the Eastern, Northern and Central District Courts in California. I am the owner of Law Offices of Maureen E. McFadden.

3. I am counsel for plaintiff Megan Kelly in this matter.

By: Maureen E. McFadden

EXHIBIT A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF ISSUES	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
I. Plaintiff's Ankle Condition	2
II. Plaintiff's January 2006 Request for Accommodation	3
III. Applera's Failure to Engage in the Interactive Process as to Plaintiff's January 2006 Request for Accommodation of her Disability	4
ARGUMENT	6
I. During January-February 2006, Plaintiff had a "Known Physical Disability Or Known Medical Condition" within the meaning of Government Code § 12940(n)	7
II. During the Time-frame January 20, 2006-February 1, 2006, Plaintiff Made A Request for Reasonable Accommodation, and was Willing to Participate in an Interactive Process with Applera	9
III. Applera Failed to Engage in a Timely, Good Faith Interactive Process in Response to Plaintiff's January 2006 Request for Accommodation	9
CONCLUSION	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

<u>Barnett v. U.S. Air, Inc.</u> , 228 F.3d 1105 (en banc) (vacated on other grounds)	10
<u>Beck v. University of Wis. Bd. of Regents</u> , 75 F.3d 1130, 1135	10
<u>EEOC v. E.I. Du Point de Nemours & Co.</u> , 480 F.3d 724,728-30 (5 th Cir. 2007)	7
<u>Taylor v. Phoenixville School District</u> , 184 F.3d 296 (3 rd Cir. 1999)	7,10
<u>U.S. Airways, Inc. v. Barnett</u> , 535 U.S. 391 (2002)	10

STATE CASES

<u>Faust v. California Portland Cement Co.</u> , 150 Cal.App.4 th 864, 887 (2007)	7,8
<u>Gelfo v. Lockheed Martin Corp.</u> , 140 Cal.App.4 th 34 (2007)	7
<u>Jensen v. Wells Fargo Bank</u> , 85 Cal.App.4 th 245, 266 (2000)	9

STATE STATUTES

Cal. Govt. Code § 12926(k)	8,9
Cal. Govt. Code § 12940(n)	2,7,8,9

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

2 C.F.C. Pt. 1630, App. § 1630.9	10
--	----

FEDERAL RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d)	7
-----------------------------	---

STATE REGULATIONS

2 Cal. Code Regs. § 7293.6(e)(1)(A)(2)(a)	8
---	---

OTHER AUTHORITIES

CACI No. 2546	7
---------------------	---